

Agenda Item: IV.**DATE:** November 18, 2004**SUBJECT:** Improving Teacher Quality Grant Program Awards, 2004-05**ACTION RECOMMENDED:** Approval

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: Operating as Title II of the No Child Left Behind Act, the Improving Teacher Quality Grant Program is a federally funded program which provides grants to public and private higher education institutions and non-profit organizations. Administered in Tennessee by the Tennessee Higher Education Commission, these grants are designed to conduct training for K-12 teachers, paraprofessionals and principals. Eligible subject areas include Mathematics, Science, English/Language Arts, Social Studies, Foreign Languages (including English as a Second Language) and related Arts. The Commission adopted a State plan and created an Advisory Committee to review grant proposals and make funding recommendations to the Commission. This year's Advisory Committee is listed on Attachment A.

The attached materials present the projects and funding levels recommended by the Advisory Committee. The recommended projects reflect those that provide maximum effectiveness in involvement of instructional effort for public and private K-12 schools in Tennessee.

As a method of soliciting proposals in direct alignment with Tennessee's K-12 needs, the Request for Proposals included special categories that could be integrated into a project's goals and objectives. This initiative highlights strategies for professional development. Another feature in this year's review process was a two-tiered competition which included the General Competition and a Capacity Building Competition. The Capacity Building Competition was included to encourage more sustained and time intensive professional development. It differed from the General Competition in three major ways; institutions could request up to \$150,000 over a 17 month period, the participants would receive at least 6 hours of graduate credit, and school administrator participation was mandatory. The General Competition was the same as in previous years with institutions being able to request up to \$75,000 over an 8-month period.

Forty-three proposals were submitted; of those, the Advisory Committee recommended funding for 19 projects totaling \$1,299,185.

In past years, there have been questions as to whether projects offering credit courses at public institutions will generate dollars through the funding formula. As in the past, such courses will be required to be designated as contract courses; thus, will not generate dollars under the formula.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION INCLUDED: A list of recommended institutions and funding levels is provided in Attachment B. The General Competition projects will be funded for the period January 1, 2005 to September 30, 2005. The grant review process is described on Attachment C to this agenda item.

OTHER SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS AVAILABLE: All grant proposals are available for review at the Commission office.

ATTACHMENT A
2004-05
IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Dr. Bradley Windley
Tennessee Higher Education Commission

Dr. Calvin Brown
Tennessee State University

Dr. Thomas Broadhead
University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Dr. Fred Heifner
Cumberland University

Dr. Claudia Joplin
University of Tennessee, Martin

Dr. Vanita Lytle-Sherrill
Volunteer State Community College

Dr. Mary Jo Howland
State Board of Education

Ms. Linda Jordan
Tennessee Department of Education

Dr. Deborah Nunn
Belmont University

Dr. Scott Eddins
Tennessee Department of Education

Ms. Mary Ann Lewis
Tennessee Department of Education

Ms. Linda Creek
Tennessee Department of Education

Ms. Jennifer Nix
Tennessee Department of Education

Ms. Judy Haston
Tennessee Department of Education

Mr. Terrance Gibson
Tennessee Education Association

Mr. William Arnold
Tennessee Higher Education Commission

Dr. Celeste Williams
Tennessee State University

**ATTACHMENT B
RECOMMENDED PROJECTS FOR 2003-2004**

PUBLIC FOUR YEAR INSTITUTIONS

East Tennessee State University \$67,774

Dr. Jesse W. Johnson, Dr. Martha Coutinho
“Project ASPIRE: Teachers Succeeding with Students with Asperger's Syndrome and High Functioning Autism”

East Tennessee State University \$55,533

Dr. Clarissa Willis
“East Tennessee Autism Training Project (ETATP)”

East Tennessee State University \$60,583

Dr. Aimee G. Govett
“Elementary Science Teaching and Learning Partnership for Northeast Tennessee”

East Tennessee State University \$40,493

Dr. Rosalind R. Gann
“Content Area Reading In ESL”

Middle Tennessee State University \$67,719

Dr. Mary B. Martin
“Powers of Ten: Number Sense Through Algebra, Astronomy, Biology and Finance”

Middle Tennessee State University \$63,429

Dr. Patricia M. Patterson, Dr. Amy J. Phelps Dr. Linda Gilbert
“Highly Qualified and Beyond: A Focus on Chemistry”

Middle Tennessee State University \$67,774

Dr. Bella Higdon
“The Academy for Teachers of the Gifted – 2005”

Middle Tennessee State University \$122,660

Dr. E. Ray Phillips, Dr. J. Padgett Kelly, Dr. Dovie Kimmins
“The Hardeman County Partnership: Systemic Initiative to Improve Middle Grades Mathematics Instruction”

University of Tennessee at Chattanooga \$67,429

Dr. Ossama A. Saleh, Dr. Ronald L. Smith
“Application of Algebra and Statistics”

<u>University of Tennessee at Chattanooga</u>	\$67,822
Dr. Deborah A. McAllister “Mathematics Navigation and Number Sense”	
<u>University of Tennessee at Knoxville</u>	\$67,810
Dr. Alan Hazari, Ms. Diane Vaughn “Inquiry-Based Physical Science for Middle School Teachers”	
<u>University of Tennessee at Knoxville</u>	\$124,950
Dr. Anne McGill-Franzen “Extended Day Kindergarten Literacy Program and Professional Development”	
<u>University of Tennessee at Knoxville</u>	\$109,253
Dr. Colleen P. Gilrane “[CE]3 Reading: Coordinated Effort and Collaborative Expertise to Create Excellence in Reading Instruction for all Learners”	
<u>University of Tennessee at Knoxville</u>	\$60,583
Dr. Michael L. Bentley, Dr. Sussan Hamilton “Inquiry, Integration, and Differentiation: A U.T. Professional Development Institute for Appalachian Educators”	
<u>University of Tennessee at Martin</u>	\$60,911
Dr. Crystal Whitlow “Mentoring in Inclusive Environments”	
<u>University of Tennessee at Martin</u>	\$67,394
Ms. Patty Q. Flowers, Ms. Bonnie V. Daniel “(TEMI) Technology Enhanced Mathematics Instruction”	
<u>University of Tennessee at Martin</u>	\$65,768
Dr. Cahit Erkal, Mr. Jamie Rickman “Activity Based Physics and Astronomy Summer Institute for Middle and Junior-High School Teachers: Year Three - Technology Version”	

PUBLIC TWO YEAR INSTITUTIONS

<u>Volunteer State Community College</u>	\$62,808
Ms. Nancy Morris “Science Institute II: A Bridge Between Middle and High School”	
<u>Volunteer State Community College</u>	\$31,100
Dr. Karen N. Valencia, Dr. Carole Bucy Dr. Alice Amonette “Learner-Centered Outcomes-Based Education in Social Studies for Middle School Teachers”	

ATTACHMENT C

PROPOSAL REVIEW PROCESS

Upon receipt by THEC, proposals were reviewed to determine if all required materials were included and if the proposal responded to the federal program requirements. Incomplete proposals, late proposals, proposals not addressing identified grant program needs, and proposals from ineligible applicants were excluded from the grant review. Proposal writers were notified by postcard as to whether THEC received the proposal and whether it was sent to reviewers.

The grant review panel was divided into 5 teams. Each proposal was assigned a lead discussant. The lead discussant was responsible for: giving a careful 2-5 minute overview of the entire project without offering any personal opinions and the lead discussant served as the moderator of the discussion concerning that proposal including helping the panel arrive at a consensus based on the criteria.

PROCESS

Team 1

Lead discussant 1 – Proposal 1

- 2 –5 minute description of project (without opinion)
- 5-10 minute discussion of all team members that read proposal (opinions allowed)
- 2-5 minute discussion including all panelists who have questions or opinions
- Vote to place proposal in one of three categories: Do not fund, Fund, or Fund based on conditions;
- The numeric ratings were considered in breaking ties later in the review process.

These steps were repeated for the remaining proposals of each lead discussant.

These steps were repeated for Teams 2, 3, 4 and 5 until all proposals were reviewed.